

good 1965 return. And why should she be forced to beg for her own fish from a nation whose fishery on our stocks began after the self-caused World War II?

This run is no longer virgin stock. Japan in an unprecedented flaunt of conservation, took nearly 2 million immature fish off Adak in August.

We must no longer ask, we must assert. No longer debate, but demand. Your dignity as a citizen, our dignity as a nation is at stake.

Need for Prompt Remedy

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the following commentary might properly be entitled "What's Wrong Here?" I do not believe there is a better way to make a case for an existing inequity than to present a specific situation. I therefore submit excerpts from a letter received from a young man in the armed services which I trust my colleagues in the House will read and give serious consideration:

I have been in the Army 19 months and was recently promoted from E-3 to E-4 and found that my wife's class Q allotment did not increase like that of a man who has only one dependent. The allotment for an E-3 and two dependents and less than 2 years' service is \$123.10 and it remains the same for an E-4 with two dependents. The allotment for an E-3 with one dependent and less than 2 years' service is \$95.20, but it moves up to \$123.10 when a man is promoted to an E-4. This doesn't seem at all equitable.

For example, one of my buddies who has the same rating as I do and a wife and no children draws the same allotment. His wife is, of course, able to take employment, whereas we have a child, which naturally requires that my wife remain at home with the baby.

President Johnson recently concluded that families with an income of less than \$3,000 annually are in the poverty class and should be given economic assistance through the Federal Government. Yet, strangely, a man in the service with two dependents receives \$83.10 for living quarters and \$123.10 per month allotment, which, with his basic pay, gives him an annual income of approximately \$2,800. The serviceman with one dependent is naturally farther down on the poverty list by the same yardstick.

If I had not worked and saved my money before coming into the service, it would have been impossible for me to provide the basic necessities along with maintaining our life insurance, automobile insurance, and other miscellaneous obligations. When a man is required to give 2 years out of his life, it certainly doesn't seem right that he should be required to use funds for which he worked and saved during his civilian life for the right and privilege of serving his country. I pass these comments on to you, not alone because of my personal situation, but because there are many others like me with whom I have talked who have so expressed themselves.

I hope and trust that Congress will do something to rectify these inequities in the near future. It probably will not affect me since I am nearing the end of my term of service, but it seems to me that this should be corrected in the interest of the men who serve our country in the future.

It is my understanding that legislation is being offered by most of the members of the esteemed Committee on Armed Services to increase military pay and correct some of these inequities which prevail. This legislation should be a must in this session of Congress.

Hanoi's Role in the Vietnam War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by our distinguished columnist, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 26, 1965.

Mr. Drummond presents part of the proof of the role being played by the North Vietnamese Communist government in supplying the Vietcong with arms and leadership.

The article follows:

THE MASSIVE PROOF: UNITED STATES CAN NOW DOCUMENT HANOI'S ROLE IN VIET WAR
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The United States is ready to submit to the U.N. Security Council or any other proper body, massive and mounting proof that the war in South Vietnam is armed and directed from Hanoi.

The evidence is now fully prepared for use by the Government at the right moment. It rests on captured arms, captured documents, Communist defectors, and interrogation of North Vietnamese prisoners of war. It proves that the aggression against South Vietnam is inspired, commanded, controlled and supplied by the Communist regime in Hanoi.

This evidence shows a systematic violation of the frontiers which Hanoi agreed to respect in the Geneva agreements of 1954 and in the Laotian agreement of 1962.

This evidence makes North Vietnam the procuring force in the attempt to overthrow the Government of South Vietnam and, in the words of Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, "the mainspring of the whole Vietcong effort."

Here is a good cross-section of the information which documents the role Hanoi has played from the beginning:

Infiltration: From 1959 to 1964 Hanoi has sent 19,000 military personnel across the border to wage war against South Vietnam. This figure comes from cross-checked reports from prisoners, defectors, and secret documents. There is substantial information that 15,000 additional infiltrators entered South Vietnam during this period. In guerrilla warfare 20,000 guerrillas can be equal to a regular army of 200,000 to 300,000.

Vietcong leadership: Most officers, the key cadres, and the technicians for hard-core Vietcong units operating in South Vietnam are from North Vietnam.

Arms supplies: Large and increasing quantities of weapons are entering from outside. One captured Vietcong said that his entire company was recently supplied with modern Chinese weapons. A Vietcong arms cache contained recoilless rifles and ammunition, carbines, detonating fuses, 110 pounds of TNT, fuses for mortar shells, and other arms. Their identifiable sources were: North Viet-

nam, Red China, East Germany, and Hungary.

Another massive cache was seized last week. In it were 80 tons of armaments from Communist countries. Included in the capture were 1,000 Russian-made carbines, 900 Red Chinese rifles, several hundred Soviet submachineguns, antiaircraft guns, recoilless rifles, and grenades.

Supposedly the source of manufacture of these weapons is to be obliterated. Captured documents reveal instructions from Hanoi directing the infiltrators "to remove all markings" from their munitions. The infiltrators themselves start out from near Hanoi in North Vietnamese uniforms and change into South Vietnamese uniforms at the frontier.

The admission: Hanoi has officially declared that its "army is the instrument of the class struggle to liberate South Vietnam." It has said that "it is the brain and the factor that decides."

The thanks: The Vietcong have several times thanked Hanoi for its armed support.

No deviation: The Vietcong Communists have never once deviated from the Hanoi party line.

This is the evidence which caused the three-nation international control commission (India, Canada, with Communist Poland dissenting) to report that "beyond any reasonable doubt North Vietnam has sent arms and men into South Vietnam with the aim of overthrowing the legal government."

This is the evidence which has caused the United States to conclude that the Hanoi regime is in full strategic control of every action by the Vietcong and is providing the major share of its equipment and supplies.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 11, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1965, marks the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On that date in 1821 a band of Greek patriots began their struggle for freedom. This was the first echo in Europe of the American Revolution, and their efforts were inspired by the example of the revolution only a few years before which had brought about the existence of the "land of the free." The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots.

The Greeks looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in 1821 was an address to the American people:

Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue.

Freedom for the Greeks did not come easily or quickly. Finally, 8 long years later with the sympathy and support of the American people and ultimately that

A1384

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 24, 1965

of the entire civilized world, they won, as we had won earlier.

Mr. Speaker, Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor, and we too should be proud that we contributed to their inspiration as we join them in commemorating the 144th anniversary of their independence on March 25.

The Christian Science Monitor Gives an Example of the Area Redevelopment Administration's Success in Providing New Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently published a story describing the excellent work of the Area Redevelopment Administration in helping to provide jobs in a depressed mining area of West Virginia.

The establishment of the Ravens-Shinnston Corp. plant, as described by the Monitor article, is a model of how the Area Redevelopment program works at its best.

In this case, the people of the area, led by their elected officials, the State government, private industry, and the Area Redevelopment Administration joined together cooperatively to create new jobs in a new industry for West Virginians who would otherwise have had little hope of escaping the miseries of chronic unemployment.

ANOTHER SUCCESS STORY IN WEST VIRGINIA: ARA RETRAINING SALVAGES WORKERS (By David K. Willis)

SHINNSTON, W. VA.—Pete Oliveto, cheerful in brown shirt and work trousers, pushed back his welder's mask and looked around at the men working on the factory floor. "Does a lot for the area, a plant like this," he said. "Most of these men wouldn't have jobs otherwise. See him? Just out of school. What hope would he have had? There's no jobs here anywhere."

"Me, I was out of work for 8 months one time. Still got my unemployment card in my pocket. Show it to you if you like. I worked in the mines. Made more money there than here—but you'd work 1 day and never know about the next."

"Been here 2 years now. Spent last Christmas with my wife and kids. Second time in 15 years I remember doing that. Always away working or looking before."

This is a success story in the Federal Government's Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA). That is what the ARA is supposed to be doing: Giving men like Pete Oliveto a chance to earn a living.

In many other areas ARA has failed.

ARA was established in 1961 to spur job-creating businesses in depressed areas throughout the United States. Since that time it has given out \$300 million in loans and grants for this purpose to communities and business firms.

The agency, which has about \$82 million left in its lending account, is due to expire this June. President Johnson is asking that the program be extended.

DEFENSE WORK

Here, in a 400-foot-long factory 2 miles south of Shinnston on Route 19, sparks fly and hammers clang as the Ravens-Shinnston Corp. works two shifts a day.

The factory makes trailer tanks for long hauls. It makes 1½-ton ammunition carriers and 600-gallon storage tanks for the Army.

The plant superintendent, Hobart Cutright, says 32 men are working now. There will be 70 more by the end of the year. With three shifts, the total could eventually hit 250.

Standing with us, running his hand admiringly over a steel girder, was Shinnston's Mayor, George Rice. Mr. Rice has pushed the plant from the start.

"We saw the handwriting on the wall here a couple of years ago," he said matter-of-factly. "It's all mining here, but the mines are automated, and men have nothing to do."

"So we knew we had to do something. A group of us got together in town (Mr. Rice runs the local drugstore) and talked about getting some industry to come in."

COOPERATION SEEN

To qualify for an ARA low cost, long-term loan, the Shinnston Area Development Association held a meeting in the Moose clubhouse. It drew up a plan.

ARA sent down a team of inspectors, the State Industrial Development Authority approved, local townspeople dug deep into their pockets, and the project was launched in a blaze of energy.

The Ravens Corp. has long manufactured trailer tank bodies. It provided the technical experts. A big factor in getting ARA money—\$424,000 in all—was a federally assisted retraining school already operating in Harrison County.

The 15,000 people in the greater Shinnston area put up \$75,000. Ravens added \$200,000.

"People were impatient," Mr. Rice said. "The plant took a year to build. There's a lot of redtape to go through. But we think ARA has done a fine job. We're very pleased."

A major delay came when local interests fought with Ravens to have a bigger voice on the board of the new company. The dispute now has been settled.

The plant has been helped immeasurably by two Defense Department contracts—one of \$1.4 million for the ammunition carriers, the other for the 600-gallon tanks.

"Being a depressed area and having an ARA [loan] must have helped us get them," said Mr. Rice. "Anyway, we have them, and we're fulfilling them."

As he spoke Pentagon inspectors were making final checks on the first dark-green carrier at one end of the building.

"We estimate it costs \$5,000 to train a single man—that's counting time lost on the job as he gets used to what he's doing," said Mr. Cutright. "But we're doing it, and the plant will go. No doubt about that."

Supreme Court Decree

SPEECH OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court has no legal authority to reapportion the legislatures of the States of this Union. The Supreme Court decision of June 15, 1964, ordering reapportionment of State legislatures, par-

ticularly the State senates, is one of the most autocratic and dangerous decrees in all the history of the civilized world. This decision is reminiscent of the decrees handed down by Roman Emperors. I know of no decree in modern history wrought with more danger to freedom and self-government at the local level.

This order of the Supreme Court is a blow at the foundation stones of this Republic and our free enterprise system. This decision of the Supreme Court makes a mockery of the Constitution and is an insult to the Congress. If this decree of the Court is permitted to stand by the Congress, the Supreme Court can and will someday reapportion membership in the U.S. Senate. The Court can and will reapportion membership on boards of trustees, magistrates, and local officials throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my colleagues in introducing a bill which would nullify this unconstitutional and unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court. The bill I am introducing would return legislative power to the people, as intended by the Constitution. No legislative body in this country, whether it is the State legislature, city council, or the Congress itself, is free as long as this Damoclean sword of the Supreme Court is suspended over the legislative processes.

This bill would end the apportionment and reapportionment of State legislatures by the Supreme Court. It would keep the Supreme Court from reviewing reapportionment cases and would restrict the district courts from having the jurisdiction to entertain cases that would reapportion State legislatures.

The Supreme Court has usurped legislative powers. My people are fearful that we are drifting into a dictatorship by the Supreme Court. The Congress must act now to preserve the liberties of our people.

America's Vanishing Merchant Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it was once said that illusion is the first of all pleasures. But when a popular belief threatens to strangle a vital arm of the Nation's defense and economic power, such self-deception can be fatal. There is a growing fear that America's once unchallenged maritime supremacy has become such a nationalistic mirage—a myth supported by indifference, deceptive statistics, and a naive misconception of the future role of oceangoing commercial carriers.

The United States, the largest trading Nation in the world, is today a sixth-rate maritime power—ranking behind Great Britain, Liberia, Norway, and the U.S.S.R. The fact is that Russia will soon have the world's largest merchant

Douglas Dillon deserves the thanks of the American people for a job well done. I wish him well on his return to private life.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE 18TH ANNUAL MONETARY CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION AT PRINCETON INN, PRINCETON, N.J., FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1965.

This is the fourth year in which I have had the special privilege of addressing this conference of distinguished leaders in the world of finance. These have been years of remarkable innovation in financial practices and policies—public and private—both within the United States and abroad. Internationally, we have fashioned a framework for mutual consultation and cooperation that—measured against our common objectives of steady growth and flourishing world trade, coupled with substantial price stability—has proved both durable and viable.

But, despite much excellent progress, our international financial system still suffers from a disturbing disequilibrium—one I have discussed with you on previous occasions. This is the seemingly chronic tendency for capital to flow between countries in directions and in amounts that impede the entire process of restoring balance in the payments of deficit and surplus countries alike.

The group of 10, in their recent study of the international monetary system, concluded unanimously that ways must be found to improve the process of balance-of-payments adjustment. The United States wholeheartedly joined in that conclusion and welcomes the systematic studies of this matter now underway in working party III of the OECD. However, if these studies are to have truly useful results they must face up to the stubborn and extremely difficult problem posed by the deep structural imbalances in the world's capital markets that have enormously complicated the smooth functioning of the adjustment mechanism.

The nature of the problem is clearly illustrated by developments in our balance of payments last year. By 1964, the measures we had undertaken to improve our trade position and to reduce the balance-of-payments impact of our aid and defense programs had achieved visible and gratifying results. Yet, as you know, our deficit last year was once again disappointingly large, primarily because capital had poured out of the United States in unprecedented amounts—in significant part to the strong surplus countries of Western Europe. The recent annual report of the Monetary Commission of the European Economic Community highlighted this point, noting that an improvement of about \$3 billion in U.S. transactions for goods and services and Government accounts had been largely offset by a \$2 billion increase in private capital outflows.

Within the basic limitations set by the needs of an underemployed domestic economy, the United States throughout the last 4 years had been alert to the fact that excessively easy money at home could only aggravate the problem of capital outflows. By shifting much of the burden for promoting domestic expansion to fiscal policy and tax reduction, we have enabled our monetary authorities to move gradually, but steadily, to an essentially neutral monetary policy.

Our short-term market interest rates have climbed significantly since the 1960-61 recession, responding largely to two half-point increases in the discount rate. With the discount rate, now at 4 percent, Treasury bill yields are within one-half percent or so of their postwar high—a high reached only briefly during the period of very tight money in 1959. Loan-deposit ratios of banks have gradually climbed to a postwar peak, and other

traditional measures of bank liquidity have confirmed a gradual tightening in their position. The Federal Reserve has rather steadily reduced the free reserves of the banking system, and, for the past month, the banks have actually operated with a small net borrowed reserve position. While corporate cash flow has remained high, liquidity ratios have reached the lowest levels in a quarter of a century.

Clearly, credit has remained readily available in the United States throughout this period, and our bank lending and long-term interest rates are still low relative to most other countries. But it is also a palpable fact that rising investment opportunities and credit demands at home, combined with increases in the Federal Reserve discount rate and greater restraint in the provision of bank reserves, have noticeably reduced the ease of our market. Yet, instead of declining in response to these developments, the capital outflow has accelerated.

This fact alone casts into doubt the thesis of those who view the problem almost entirely in terms of excessive domestic liquidity, with tighter monetary policy the simple, effective, and unique remedy. Naturally, if one defines an excess of liquidity as synonymous with an excessive capital outflow, I suppose that position would be unassailable. But that kind of analysis bears no realistic relationship to the difficulty we face today. All it does is to define away the substance of a very real and tough problem.

In my judgment, it is much more enlightening—although still not the entire answer—to analyze the problem in terms of differences in investment profitability, rather than in terms of liquidity. Consider, for example, the outflow of funds for direct investment abroad, which has continued to rise, reaching \$2.3 billion in 1964. At the present time, many American firms clearly believe that a portion of their available resources can be most profitably invested in subsidiaries abroad. That calculation rests on a variety of familiar considerations—the more rapid growth of certain foreign markets; a desire to operate inside a wall of external tariffs; proximity to readily available raw materials; and lower production costs—to name some of the most obvious factors.

But perhaps most important of all is the fact that U.S. industrial development so far exceeds that of any other country. This has brought with it a degree of competition that is unknown anywhere else in the world. Add to this our enormous flow of savings, and it is not surprising to find a general acceptance of lower rates of return on capital in this country than prevail elsewhere—rates that only partially reflect differences in risks between investments here and abroad. At the same time, our businessmen and investors tend to place higher capital values on prospective earnings than is the case elsewhere, and our corporations at times find it attractive to pay higher prices in the acquisition of going concerns abroad than would seem reasonable to local investors.

Whatever the specific reason that particular direct investments abroad appear to a given company to be a more profitable use for its funds, the fact is that we cannot effectively influence this judgment by simply reducing liquidity and tightening credit at home. So long as the basic difference in profitability remains, any gain in terms of reduced foreign investment will entail a substantially larger cost in terms of dampening domestic investment as well. There seems, therefore, little warrant either in theory or in practice for basing economic policy on a presumption that corporate managers will permit considerations of the rate and availability of bank credit to affect their decisions on foreign investment, while leaving the domestic economy untouched.

In the broadest sense, international differences in the rate of return on investment—

as these differences are reflected in interest rates and the intensity of demands for credit—also lie behind the accelerating outflow of bank loans and other credits abroad. This structural imbalance forced us to propose the interest equalization tax during the summer of 1963. It effectively increased the cost of long-term portfolio credit to foreigners in developed countries. As a result the outflow of long-term portfolio capital in 1964 dropped back to the 1960 level.

The plain fact is that foreign borrowers are willing and able to pay higher rates than domestic borrowers of similar credit standing with free access to the vast resources of the American credit market, and foreign loans are thus in many instances more profitable to the lending banks. The same is true for the placement of liquid funds by our corporations. But the massive outflow of these types of credit is also related to other deep-seated structural characteristics of American and foreign capital markets.

As you know, with rare exceptions, foreign financial markets, even in countries with the most highly developed economies, lack a large and fluid short-term money market. Long-term bond markets are usually even more constricted. As a result, in most other countries there is simply no effective mechanism by which private borrowers and lenders—and to a very considerable extent governments—can readily raise or dispose of large sums in short periods of time in the open market. Instead, the available funds within each country are channeled almost entirely through a relatively few big institutions dealing with individual customers on a personalized basis. These institutional markets are fairly well insulated from the short-term money market, and frequently respond only sluggishly if at all to the actions of the monetary authorities.

The fluidity and size of the market available to most private borrowers abroad is further impaired by the fact that many foreign governments preempt a very large fraction of the savings available for investment, or direct it into officially sanctioned uses, frequently with a sizable subsidy for preferred borrowers added along the way. This is partly a natural result of basic social decisions to provide, through government social insurance programs, the protection for citizens that we in the United States furnish to a much larger extent through private insurance and private industry. But, it is also a reflection, in many instances, of a conscious desire to provide special preferences to one major group of borrowers or another, and to maintain a high degree of government control of national economic development. In either case, the natural result is to leave those businesses and other borrowers that must look to the remainder of the market more or less perpetually starved for funds, and with an impelling desire to seek needed capital from abroad.

All of these factors have contributed to a structure of long-term interest rates in Europe that, with only one or two exceptions, has remained throughout the postwar period at levels that, in the light of past history, are unusually high. Official discount rates, and the money market rates more immediately influenced by the official rates, often bear little relationship to the load charges payable by local borrowers. And, faced with constricted internal markets, and thus denied a full range of fiscal and monetary tools, the authorities themselves often find it essential to pursue essentially domestic credit objectives—and in some instances even to finance internal budgetary needs—through adjustments in external flows of funds. Sometimes this is done by borrowing directly from abroad and sometimes by seeking to influence the external borrowing or placement of funds by their commercial banks.

The sheer size of the U.S. economy and the tremendous volume of funds raised in our

March 24, 1965

5610

credit markets—estimated last year at over \$70 billion—help account for the much greater fluidity of our markets and their ability to adjust to, and absorb, large domestic or foreign demands with relative ease. But it is not a question of size alone. The relative freedom of the market mechanism, and the intensity of competitive pressures among institutions with a wide variety of investment options, permit funds to flow promptly from one sector of our economy to another in response to changing demands. And, a long history of confidence in our currency, further fortified by the stability of our prices in recent years, has encouraged individuals and investment institutions to commit funds freely at long term.

As a result of the pressure of the huge volume of private savings seeking investment in our market, our long-term interest rate structure has remained essentially stable during the past 4 years, even though money market rates have risen by 1½ percent or more to a range of 4 to 4½ percent. As a result, the differential between short- and long-term rates has almost disappeared. Nevertheless, the bond market has continued to absorb a record volume of long-term financing at stable rate levels.

Another indication of the strength of our longer term markets is that, over the past 4 years, they have not merely provided the vast amount of funds necessary to support high levels of homebuilding, a remarkable expansion in business investment, and the rapidly growing needs of our States and localities. They have also provided funds to the Government, equal to the entire \$28.8 billion Federal deficit during the first 4 years of this administration. During that period more than that amount was placed in savings bonds and marketable debt maturing in over 5 years. This achievement is reflected in the increase of almost 1 year or 20 percent in the average length of the marketable debt to a level last seen in mid-1956.

In this setting we could not expect moderately tighter monetary policies to bring the needed reduction in the outflow of long-term funds abroad. The disparities in the structure of the capital markets of our different countries are simply too great to permit us to rely heavily on that approach toward adjustment. Much more is needed to bring interest rates here and in other industrialized countries into the rough alignment that is surely necessary if we are to put a permanent end to the destabilizing capital flows that have characterized the past 2 years.

It might, of course, be argued that extremely tight money would be able to do the job if continued over a long enough period. Such a policy rests on the highly doubtful assumption that in spite of our huge volume of savings it would be technically feasible—perhaps by drastically reducing the money supply—to raise the general level of our bank and long-term interest rates by the 1½ to 2 percent that would be needed to achieve interest rate parity with Europe.

But even granting that assumption, such a policy would surely be self-defeating. Before it could achieve the interest rate objective, the extreme restriction of credit would surely move us toward domestic recession, and at a time when our economy is already failing to use its resources to the full. A recession would, in turn, delay our fundamental aim of creating a more favorable climate for investment in the United States. At the same time, it would rapidly create forces for easy money that would be likely to prove irresistible. Thus the end result would not be an improvement but rather an aggravation of our balance-of-payments problem.

To cite these limitations and difficulties in the use of monetary policy is not, of course, to say that monetary policy does not have a useful and indeed essential role to play in

helping the adjustment process in the United States, as in other countries. It has played such a role, is playing such a role now, and will continue to do so in the future. In fact, as I suggested earlier, one of our chief reasons for relying primarily upon fiscal policy to stimulate the domestic economy was to give monetary policy additional freedom in coping with our balance-of-payments problem. And I can assure you that monetary policy remains fully available for further use should the need arise. But I see no realistic prospect that the full burden for achieving a permanent international adjustment in capital flows can reasonably be thrust on American monetary policy alone now or in the foreseeable future.

Instead, as I have suggested before to this group, the only really satisfactory longrange solution to our present problem of excessive capital outflows lies in achieving a more attractive environment for investment within the United States through tax reduction and sustained growth, together with the development of far larger, far more efficient and far more flexible capital markets abroad. While there has been some encouraging progress in both of these directions, much more remains to be done.

These are, of course, long-run measures, and their influence on capital flows must be expected to emerge only slowly. For the time being, the existing disequilibrium—and the urgency of reducing our deficit—has required that we seek the cooperation of our banks and other financial institutions, as well as of our industrial firms, in voluntarily reducing the flow of capital abroad. The response of those asked to participate in this voluntary program has been most gratifying. The effects are already clearly visible both in the foreign exchange markets and in our preliminary payments statistics which point to a sharp and favorable change since mid-February. But two swallows don't make a summer. We need a considerable period of balance to offset the deficits of the past. We know we can count on your cooperation in achieving this vitally needed result.

But the success of our present program does not, of course, meet the basic problem. The nations of the free world, working together, must develop better means for influencing capital flows within a basic framework of free markets and national objectives—and without placing intolerable burdens either upon monetary policy or upon the resources of the international monetary system.

We must be under no illusion that a different or improved international monetary system could in any way eliminate the need for adjusting these flows. But these two questions are nonetheless related, for one of the basic functions of the international monetary system is to provide sufficient means for financing deficits and surpluses to permit the working out of an orderly process of adjustment.

This linkage between the process of adjustment and the international monetary system seems to me to be at the source of much of the confusion and difficulty evident in recent international efforts to develop a common approach toward the further evolution of the international payments system. All the major countries are fully agreed, I believe, on the need for developing an assured method of generating international liquidity in adequate, but no excessive, amounts as world trade and production increases over the years ahead. This much clearly emerged from the studies of the group of 10 and the International Monetary Fund last year.

But in recent months, there has been little progress toward more concrete agreement on methods and approaches. The pronounced divergencies in view that have become evident can, I believe, be traced in good part to quite different assumptions about the rela-

tionship of international monetary reform to the current U.S. payments deficit.

The overriding need, in one European view, is to develop a mechanism which would force a prompt end to our payments of deficits. We fully agree with these European friends on the necessity for achieving early balance in our international accounts. And we intend to achieve this goal by our own actions, which now for the first time cover all aspects of our payments problem.

But, in assessing the problems of the international monetary system, our concern and that of a number of other countries has been to look toward the future, when there will no longer be an American payments deficit pumping dollars into the reserves of other countries. So the thrust of our thinking has been to find the best way of developing supplementary means of providing the liquidity that is likely to be needed. We feel that this can only be done gradually and by building on what we now have. And we emphatically disagree with the thesis recently propounded in some quarters which would turn back the clock and embrace an outmoded and highly restrictive system—a system that would surely cripple the growth of international trade and commerce as our deficit was ended.

Under the circumstances, with these broad differences of approach, any final resolution of the variety of issues that have been raised seems to me highly unlikely until the United States has brought its international payments into balance. As that is done it will become less and less easy to ignore the potential need for supplementary sources of reserve assets and international credit facilities. Meanwhile, difficult and time consuming technical studies are well underway under the auspices of the group of 10, helping to clarify the issues and to evaluate alternative techniques. These studies will, I believe, provide the basis for timely agreements on ways and means for improving the present monetary system well in advance of any urgent need.

In looking back on the past 4 years, and on the postwar period as a whole, there can be no question that the present system—anchored on gold and the dollar, and effectively supplemented by the International Monetary Fund—has served the world well. The extremes of inflation and deflation characteristic of other postwar periods have been avoided. Barriers to trade have been lowered or removed. And, in this environment, the vast productive capabilities of the free world have been released to the benefit of us all.

The challenge for the future is to build further on this system, recognizing its potential weaknesses and shortcomings, but preserving the elements of strength and flexibility that have contributed so much to our progress.

In this area, as in the area of adjusting capital flows, I have no fixed blueprint to offer to those who will share the responsibility for developing solutions. I remain confident, however, that solutions can and will be found, provided only that the United States discharges its own immediate responsibility to maintain the full strength of the dollar as the world's primary reserve currency by achieving an early balance in its international accounts. And with the help of you gentlemen that is exactly what we are going to do.

CHIEF AIM OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD BE TO ENCOURAGE THE EVOLUTION OF A WORLD OF INDEPENDENT, VIABLE NATIONS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California (at the request of Mr. ADAMS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon should be reminded that the chief aim of our foreign policy is to encourage the evolution of a world of independent, viable nations, all or most of whom would look upon our country with respect, if not friendship, and as a consequence would tend to pattern their cultures in the mold of the free society.

It is a part of the Pentagon's job to implement this foreign policy. Wars are not wholly military. There are human and psychological aspects, and the battle for men's minds is frequently more important than the military.

The use of gas in Vietnam is a step backwards of incalculable magnitude. It is not worthy of our great Nation. Its military value cannot possibly counterbalance the wave of disapproval and dismay that has swept the world.

I found this morning's comments of the New York Times and the Washington Post particularly appropriate, and the texts of the editorials follow:

GAS (NONLETHAL) IN VIETNAM

The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.

This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the Armed Forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

In Vietnam, gas was supplied and sanctioned by white men against Asians. This is something that no Asian, Communist or not, will forget. No other country has employed such a weapon in recent warfare. If the United States believed that people everywhere would be logical and "sensible" and would understand that nonlethal gas constitutes really only another form of warfare and even a relatively humane one, someone has blundered grievously.

War, as Clausewitz said, "is only a part of political intercourse, therefore by no means an independent thing in itself." It is stupid to lay the United States open to a moral condemnation that is not confined to the Communist world.

The United States claims to be fighting in Vietnam for freedom, right, justice, and other moral principles, as well as against communism and for the security of the United States and the free world. By using a noxious gas—even of a nonlethal type—the Johnson administration is falling back toward the old axiom that all's fair in war. But this happens to be a war in which the moral stature of the United States is at least as vital as bullets, shells and bombs. Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends.

[From the Washington Post]

BLACKENING OUR NAME

It is difficult to find out how much damage napalm and gas are doing the enemy but it is not hard to find out how much damage they are doing us. Our own Defense Establishment, every time it employs or permits the

South Vietnamese to employ these weapons, is doing an injury to the good name of this country.

If these weapons were being employed with decisive effect, perhaps their use might be condoned as one of the necessities of a hard and brutal war, but in this situation there is not even the satisfaction of knowing that they produced impressive results. They have been employed just enough to bring down upon this country the rebuke of the civilized world. They have been utilized just enough to hold our country up to reproach. They have been resorted to just often enough to impose upon the U.S. Information Agency an impossible propaganda disadvantage.

The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy. The use of napalm against gun emplacements is debatable, but its employment against villages is indefensible and the difficulty of confining it to combat installations so great as to dictate that it be not used at all.

We hope that President Johnson will order the Defense Department to forgo the use of all gas and napalm in this war theater at once. The people of this country are prepared for and equal to the hard measures that war dictates, when those measures are clearly inescapable and unavoidable in the prosecution of a military purpose. They will not be reconciled to the use of such weapons where alternate means of defense exist. If the war in South Vietnam can only be won by losing our good name, Americans who have patiently supported the struggle will waver in their purpose. Mr. President, let us stop all use of napalm and gas in South Vietnam at once.

OPPRESSION OF MINORITIES IN TRANSYLVANIA

(Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. ADAMS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the persecution and oppression of minorities by the Communist regime in Rumania has reached serious proportions and deserves to be condemned publicly by the Congress. The minorities affected are the Hungarians and Saxons who have lived for centuries in Transylvania which is now under Rumanian jurisdiction.

The subtle but nonetheless cruel and harsh plan of persecution launched against these minorities has caused grave concerns among many Americans whose relatives and friends are the victims. Bulletin No. 17 of the International Commission of Jurists is devoted to an exposé of the tactics used by the Communist regime in Rumania. Many correspondents who have had an opportunity to visit Transylvania have returned with an abundance of criticism of what they have seen.

The theory of communism makes extravagant claims about the equal treatment of all people and is particularly critical of mistreatment of minorities. But the practice of communism is a far cry from the promises of its theory. What the Rumanian Communist regime is doing to the minorities in Transylvania follows a well-established habit of all Communist regimes.

Oppression of human rights is a standard practice for all under their control and certain elements of the population are singled out for particularly harsh treatment.

Our sympathies go out to the Rumanian people for the persecution they have suffered at the hands of the Communist regime in control of their country. We are aware that neither the Communist Party nor the government installed by force in Rumania represents the freely expressed will of the people. The fault for persecution of minorities in Transylvania rests solely upon the Communist Party of Rumania which, as is well known, controls every facet of life in that country.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Resolution 290 for the purpose of providing the House of Representatives with an opportunity to condemn publicly the oppressive practices of the Communist regime in Rumania against the Hungarian and Saxon minorities in Transylvania. My resolution requests the President to use his good office in such manner as he deems appropriate to bring relief to these persecuted minorities.

I hope the House will act favorably and soon on this matter.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, between November 30 and December 12, of last year, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council—IA-ECOSOC—held its third annual meeting to review developments under the Alliance for Progress in Lima, Peru. IA-ECOSOC is one of the three dependent organs of the Organization of American States—OAS—and has provided since 1961 inter-American multilateral direction for the Alliance for Progress.

It was my good fortune to serve with my colleague, Congressman ARMISTEAD SELDON, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the conference last December. Congressman SELDON is Chairman of the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. His profound knowledge of Latin American affairs was an invaluable contribution to the delegation.

The conference opened with a preparatory 1 week meeting at the expert level preceding the meeting at the ministerial level. The U.S. delegation at the ministerial meeting was headed by the very able Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Thomas C. Mann, recently nominated by the President for Under

Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Deputy U.S. Coordinator William D. Rogers headed the U.S. delegation at the meeting of experts. The quality of the work of both of these men deserved high commendation. Certainly, the effectiveness of the U.S. delegation was due in large part to their experienced and effective leadership.

The climate of the conference was both positive and optimistic. The meeting saw the launching of a new special development assistance fund, to be operated and supported on a multilateral basis. The statutes of the fund and its first annual budget were approved. A number of participating nations pledged specific contributions, while others stated their intention to pledge specific contributions in the near future. The fund, with a budget of about \$9 million will support a number of multilateral Alliance activities including technical assistance for planning, technical training programs, public information and technical assistance for institutional development.

The IA-ECOSOC also considered and approved a number of resolutions in addition to the statutes and budget of the special development assistance fund. Among these were requests for the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—to give special attention to certain problems such as external trade, maritime transport charges in relation to the balance of payments, regional integration and capital flight, and the relationship between population growth and social and economic development.

One of the most hopeful reports made at the conference was the Ministers' estimation that in 1964 for the first time, the average per capita growth rate for all of Latin America would equal or possibly exceed the target rate—2½ percent per capita per year—urged in the Charter of Punta del Este. They also noted the substantial increase—at least 8 percent—in export earnings which will probably materialize in 1964, when all the statistics become available:

In the estimation of the Latin American delegates, however, foreign trade continues to be a major problem, particularly with respect to maintaining recent price increases for basic commodities.

On more pessimistic note, concerning agriculture, the review stated "that no great progress has been made, except in isolated cases, in the technical improvement of agriculture, in increasing agricultural productivity, or in carrying out programs of agrarian reform."

The Ministers stressed the need to promote more active participation in the programs for development by all the people, including rural and urban communities, labor union, business groups as well as government instrumentalities. This is a healthy development, in my opinion, and demonstrates a growing understanding of the social aspects of economic development.

In the housing field, IA-ECOSOC recognized the important efforts which many countries have already made. However, the gap between requirements and new housing construction continues

to grow. There is no question in my mind that greater efforts will therefore be necessary in this field.

The Latin American delegations were particularly concerned with the relatively slow pace of regional economic integration through the Latin American Free Trade Association, and made a call for early action to accelerate integration through existing institutions. By contrast, the Central American countries were congratulated on the progress they have made in the completion of the Central American Common Market.

The general satisfaction expressed by all delegations with respect to the work of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—which had been created by IA-ECOSOC the year before, was a highlight of the discussion at Lima. CIAP was set up as a sort of year-round multilateral executive committee of the IA-ECOSOC. Among other things, it conducted for the first time a review of each country's performance under the Alliance for Progress. This country review process is the heart of the economic and social development programs embodied in the Alliance. The concept is premised on the thesis that aid is useless unless the recipient country has developed a comprehensive plan which coordinates development problems such as land and institutional reform with monetary and fiscal problems. This was not done a few years ago with regard to Brazil, for example. The result? The United States was supporting the Brazilian currency during a period when the Brazilian Government was taking no steps to control an extremely high and rapidly growing rate of inflation.

I was greatly impressed by the preoccupation of Latin American member countries with external trade conditions and prospects. Of course, 1964 was a year that witnessed considerable international attention focused on the trade problems of the developing nations. This attention centered around the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—UNCTAD—held in Geneva, March 23 through June 16, 1964. Prior to this conference, the Latin American nations held two meetings, the first at Brasilia and the second at Alta Gracia in Argentina. At Brasilia, the government experts considered a document prepared by the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Latin America—ECLA. The conclusions adopted at this meeting were subsequently reviewed at Alta Gracia by the representatives of 19 Latin American countries under the auspices of the Organization of American States. These meetings were intended to produce a consensus as to the goals of the UNCTAD.

In Lima, most spokesmen were critical of what they feared to be a protectionist tendency of the industrial countries. Substantial improvements by the developing countries, both in export earnings and in terms of trade in 1964, did not prevent considerable concern about the future trade prospects of the region.

Underlying these criticisms is a concern which has been explicit in inter-American relations for the last three decades: The Latin American nations, their

economies oriented toward primary products, believe that the trend of the terms of trade is moving against them in favor of the industrial nations. They believe that the basic trend of the ratio of prices of their imports as compared with the earnings of their exports is increasingly unfavorable. Furthermore, they are faced with the prospect of greater balance-of-payments deficits as their imports increase due to development needs, imports made up for the most part of vitally needed machinery and machine products.

An obvious answer to these problems is a diversified economy. Even partial industrialization, however, is a lengthy process, especially in the face of severe social and consequent political strains. The one immediate answer that the Latin Americans see to this problem is expanded exports at stable world markets at higher prices. Under the umbrella of favorable world markets, the developing nations believe they can diversify and expand their economies.

Two things are certain: Most Latin American countries do not earn the import credit that they feel they need to achieve a satisfactory rate of economic growth; and, second, they believe that the answer to their problems lies in some form of regulation of the world markets for primary goods which are controlled in one way or another by the industrial nations. They believe primary products are sold in a buyer's market whereas industrial goods are sold in a seller's market.

It is obviously very frustrating to believe that the solution to one's problems is dependent on the good will of other nations. In the case of the Latin American nations, the expression to their frustration was found in UNCTAD and the meetings which preceded it.

These meetings are especially significant because they portend a new alignment in world relations. We no longer have an inter-American dialog, but a world duolog with industrial nations more or less aligned on one side of the conversation and the developing nations aligned on the other.

The effects of this alignment were certainly felt at UNCTAD where the developing nations clearly dominated the proceedings. If it maintains coherence, it will certainly be heard again in international organizations in general and in inter-American relations in particular.

The United States has clearly supported efforts of economic organization in the hemisphere, such as the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market. These groups are directed toward self-help by increasing intraregional trade. However, they also represent a possible base for a future duolog between the north and the south.

I believe that several important observations can be made about this conference:

First. The Latin American governments remain keenly sensitive to the possibility that wide price fluctuations of their principal export commodities may cause a recurrence of serious balance-of-payments deficits, thus wiping out their

sulated this effort from the fear of Federal control. Also, the National Science Foundation has no institutional interest in the administration of public education.

This cannot be said for the U.S. Office of Education. By its very nature it is interested in educational policy, as distinct from the advancement of knowledge in particular fields. The distinction is profound.

Recent amendments to the National Defense Education Act extended the teacher preparation of the Office from the fields of modern languages and student counseling into the areas of English, geography, reading, and history. The research centers in title IV of this bill, and the Federal-local supplementary centers in title III clearly project the Office into every aspect of the school curriculum, including the subjective and politically charged fields of the social sciences.

In terms of our structure of educational control, to say nothing of public policy, this progression of Federal influence in the sciences to Federal influence in the social sciences is a quantum leap toward a centralized standardized, uniform national school system.

Whether it is wise to make this "great leap forward" should be a question for intensive national debate. There can be no debate, however, about the fact that such a leap is being proposed.

THE ACTUAL SCOPE OF THE BILL

Aside from passing references in title I to "educationally deprived children" and the use in that title only of a distribution formula based upon the number of children in low-income families, this bill is not confined to the needs of the educationally deprived.

The actual scope of the bill ranges over the entire spectrum of American education and probes into its most sensitive and vital areas. The textbooks and instructional materials in title II are not limited to needy children or impoverished schools, but are admittedly provided as part of a general program; the Federal-local school centers in title III are not limited to the needs of deprived persons, or "problem" students, but specify "persons of varying talents and needs"; that is, everyone. The same universal scope is found in the rest of the bill.

It is a complete misnomer, therefore, to label this bill as one for impoverished and neglected children. Whether the bill merits support or not is beside the point. The true purpose of this bill is to authorize general aid without regard to need, and the clear intent is to radically change our historic structure of education by a dramatic shift of power to the Federal level.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational op-

portunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

TRIBUTE TO VIRGIL I. GRISSOM

(Mr. HAMILTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished son of Indiana, Virgil I. Grissom, has become the world's first space pilot and the first man to venture twice into the vastness of outer space.

As captain of the Gemini spaceship, Major Grissom altered his flight path and orbit in another historymaking achievement in America's brilliant space program.

In their 4-hour and 54-minute flight, Astronauts Grissom and John W. Young, wrote another chapter of excellence in our Nation's continuing effort to reach the moon and travel beyond.

Back home in Mitchell, in Indiana's Ninth District, the Grissom family continues to follow the quiet pattern of community life, while their most famous son makes history.

The parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Grissom, live at the family home in Mitchell. Norman Grissom, "Gus" older brother, lives in Mitchell. Another brother, Lowell, is in St. Louis; and a sister, Mrs. Joe Beavers lives in Baltimore, Md.

Major Grissom is married to the former Betty L. Moore, of Mitchell, whose father, Claude Moore, is still a hometown resident.

Back in Indiana, this great space pioneer is known as "Gus," the railroader's son who went to Purdue University, joined the Air Force, and became a much-decorated veteran of the air war over Korea.

All the world knows he is the man who rode the Mercury-Redstone flight of the Liberty Bell 7 on July 21, 1961. Launched from Cape Canaveral, the flight was suborbital, but its success completed the Redstone program and laid the foundation of our continuing series of manned flights.

Now, it is this same "Gus" Grissom who has had the well-earned privilege to open another vital part of our program of space exploration.

In Indiana, we are especially proud of him and his many achievements.

ELIMINATE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON WAR CRIME TRIALS

(Mr. SCHWEIKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the upsetting possibility that the West German Parliament may extend the statute of limitations for prosecuting Nazi war criminals for only 4 more years. I speak out against that possibility. Four years is too short a period of time. I urge the German Parliament to consider that, for the heinous crimes of genocide, this statute of limitations should be extended indefinitely.

There is no justifiable reason to do otherwise.

I have been following with great interest the progress of the West German Government as it has moved toward extending the statute of limitations. It is a subject which has evoked wide debate within the German Government.

Members of the U.S. Congress also have registered their deep interest in this debate. On January 22, 1965, I joined with a number of other Members of Congress in signing a petition to both houses of the West German Parliament, expressing our support for extending indefinitely the German statute of limitations for the prosecution of Nazi war criminals.

That was a good petition; it had a significant effect. For just recently the Bundestag, the lower house of Parliament, voted overwhelmingly for the principle of unlimited prosecution of war criminals. It sent to a parliamentary committee two draft bills, which would eliminate the statute of limitations. Only in this way can the Government of West Germany be sure that none of the mass murderers shall ever achieve immunity to prosecution. I hope the lower house of Parliament in Germany will have the fortitude and perseverance to continue their argument for this change in the law. I support their efforts, their candor, and their courage.

I am aware that German law—article 103 of the Bonn basic law—may require more than a simple act of Parliament to extend the statute indefinitely. By applying the regular method of constitutional amendment approved by two-thirds of the members of both houses, the statute could legally be extended indefinitely and war criminals previously not indicted could be prosecuted as they are found. Four years is not enough. The Government of the German Federal Republic has legal power to do more; to avoid a "reprieve from infamy" it must use this power.

Certainly there is ample precedent for having no statute of limitations on murder. None of the 50 States in our country has a statute of limitations on murder. Nor should any State or nation impose such limitations.

The limitation for the prosecution of war crimes to 20 years under the statutory criminal law of the Federal Republic of Germany does not have its origin in any enactment concerning war crimes. This limitation derives from the general provision of the German Criminal Code of 1871. By virtue of this code, prosecution for major crimes, including murder, is barred by the lapse of 20 years, unless the running of the period of limitation is either interrupted or suspended. But the crime of genocide, in which millions were exterminated, cannot be judged under the traditional standards for homicide. Nor was genocide even contemplated when this code was first adopted.

Genocide demands a different standard. It is time for that standard to be established. It can be achieved by constitutional amendment supported by two-thirds of both houses. This is the action which seems most advisable to assure that the statute on genocide will be extended indefinitely.

March 24, 1965

Excellent and thorough efforts by the German Government have been made to round up war criminals who may still be at liberty. I am impressed by the work that has been done by state prosecutors and investigations at the Ludwigsberg Center. I have read with interest the statistics on their success. But I urge that the German Parliament extend the statute of limitations indefinitely so that the embarrassment caused by one undicted war criminal walking free on May 9, 1965, or even on May 9, 1969, may be avoided. This is an eternal debt, still owed—owed in perpetuity—to those who lost their lives at Auschwitz, at Dachau, at Belsen, at Buchenwald, or any other center of infamy now part of the German past.

RESULTS OF 1965 OPINION POLL FOR 22D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

(Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 weeks over 21,000 replies have been received from residents of the 22d Congressional District of Ohio to my 1965 annual opinion poll. This response has been most gratifying, and as in previous years indicates the great in-

terest and deep concern people have in the actions of their Federal Government.

It was good to receive the many hundreds of letters and comments on the questions contained on this poll. The views expressed on these issues together with the results obtained on this questionnaire are most helpful to me in sensing the real feeling of my constituents on the important legislative proposals coming before the Congress.

The question on establishing a national policy for control of water and air pollution received the largest favorable response—88 percent, with only 6 percent opposing, and 6 percent having no opinion on this issue. Residents of the 22d District and all Greater Clevelanders are particularly familiar with and sensitive to the question of water and air pollution. It is their overwhelming view that local and State efforts combined with those of private industry are unable to handle this troublesome problem without further Federal participation.

Legislation to provide for presidential succession brought forth an 80-percent favorable response, with 11 percent opposing and 9 percent having no opinion. The people of our Nation have been aroused by the assassination of President Kennedy to the immediate and dire necessity of the Congress taking early action to provide for the orderly transi-

tion of our Government in any future emergencies.

The question bringing forth the least favorable support concerned admission of Red China to the United Nations, with 28 percent favorable, 59 percent opposed and 13 percent having no opinion. The repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act brought forth the next lowest favorable response with 33 percent favoring, 51 percent opposing, and 16 percent having no opinion.

With all the publicity on the subject of health care to the elderly, and public awareness that some Federal solution must be forthcoming to assist those in need, it is interesting to note the concern of the residents of the 22d District as to whether the social security approach is the best way to solve this problem. Favoring the social security approach were 49 percent of the replies, with 45 percent opposing this method, and 6 percent having no opinion.

The House of Representatives recently approved an appropriation to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Residents of the 22d District supported this action by a 4-to-1 majority. It is also heart warming to see the 5-to-1 majority in favor of legislation I have introduced to provide an income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition.

The complete results of this poll follow:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Do you favor or oppose—			
Medical care:			
1. A hospital and nursing home program for the elderly paid through increased social security payroll taxes on employers and employees?	49	45	6
Immigration:			
2. Abolishing the present "national origin" quota system in favor of a priority system based on the skill of immigrants or their joining close relatives in the United States?	63	25	12
Taxes:			
3. Elimination of Federal excise taxes on such items as jewelry, cosmetics, toilet articles, furs, luggage, and ladies' handbags?	71	23	6
Labor relations:			
4. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which now permits States to enact right-to-work laws barring union membership as a condition of employment?	33	51	16
Area redevelopment:			
5. Federal aid to areas plagued by chronic unemployment?	66	24	10
Education:			
6. A Federal scholarship program for needy college students?	68	24	8
7. An income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition?	78	15	7
8. The administration's general educational proposals for Federal aid in some form to all levels of education?	64	33	13
Water-air pollution:			
9. Legislation to establish a national policy for control of water and air pollution?	88	6	6
Presidential succession:			
10. The appointment by the President, with the consent of both Houses of the Congress, of a Vice President when a vacancy exists in the office of Vice President?	80	11	9
Congressional committees:			
11. Continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities?	67	17	16
Foreign policy:			
12. Giving foreign military and economic aid only to countries whose national policies are in basic agreement with the goals of the United States?	78	12	10
13. Admission of Red China into the United Nations?	28	59	13
14. Liberalizing our trade relations with Communist nations?	85	63	12
15. Continued participation in the conflict in Vietnam?	46	38	16

AUTHORITY TO USE GAS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, several Members of the House commented on the use of nonlethal gas in Vietnam. Whatever differences of opinion there may be on this issue, I think we can all agree that the decision to use the gas is one that should have been made "at the highest level," the expression used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON]. I would assume that means the President.

Therefore, it is surprising to learn that President Johnson was not consulted about the matter, even though it involved "only tactical problems." One is reminded perhaps of the rather striking debate that took place during the last campaign over the feasibility of allowing field commanders to employ tactical atomic weapons under certain conditions on their own authority.

The President, as a candidate, rejected such a policy out of hand. The Republican candidate was characterized as "trigger happy."

Now, it is odd to find that field commanders apparently have been allowed

to make a military decision with tremendous political implications. The news of it has certainly had international impact. Our adversaries have been given a propaganda opening.

Had this development occurred under a Republican President, the other side of the aisle surely would have been a turmoil of Members seeking recognition to criticize such a decisionmaking process.

I would be the last to urge that we shape our policies in the world in accordance with the shifts of world opinion. I support our President's policy in Vietnam but I emphasize it should be our President's policy. In view of the state-

March 24, 1965

CO

ments made in the last campaign by the President and members of his administration and candidates of his party, it seems only fair to ask how it was that these actions should not have merited clearance by the ultimate authority of the National Government, at the White House.